

REMARKS

The rejection of claims 1-2, 4-14, 17-26 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite is respectfully traversed. Those skilled in the art would reasonably understand that the ownership of the bus would not be granted to multiple agents at a time, and the claim is reasonably clear as written. However, claims 1, 14, 23 and 36 are amended for purposes of expediting prosecution.

Claims 1, 2, 4-14, 17-24 and 36 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The Office Action does not establish that claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-13, and 27-34 are anticipated by US patent 5,341,491 to Ramanujan ("Ramanujan") under 35 USC §102(b). The rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office Action fails to show that all the limitations of the claims are taught by Ramanujan. However, independent claims 1, 23, 27, 33, and 36 are amended to include limitations related to overriding the predetermined bus arbitration order to grant ownership to a queued agent according to a configurable ratio of a number grants of ownership to the other agents seeking ownership of the bus and issuing commands not retried, to a number of grants of ownership to queued agents. These limitations are not understood to be taught by the prior art, and the rejection is now moot. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action fails to establish that claims 1, 8-10, 14, 17-20, 23-27, 33 and 36 are anticipated by "Borland" (Borland AppServer Progam Guide), under 35 USC §102(a). The rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office Action fails to show that all the limitations of the claims are taught by Borland.

Claim 1, for example includes limitations of allocating ownership of the bus among the plurality of agents based on a predetermined bus arbitration order. The various other limitations of claim 1 and the other claims also relate to granting ownership of a bus. The cited teachings of Borland contain no apparent reference to granting of bus ownership. Nor is it apparent what elements of Borland are alleged to

correspond to the specific claim limitations. Since Borland describes a software environment for distributed transaction processing, and the cited teachings do not contain any elements that reasonably correspond to the claim limitations, further explanation is respectfully requested as to those elements of Borland that are viewed as corresponding to the claim limitations. Otherwise, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 8-10 depend from claim 1 and are not shown to be anticipated for at least the reasons set forth above.

Independent claim 14 includes limitations of receiving one or more controllable configuration parameters indicative of a desired processing ratio in which the commands issued according to the predetermined bus arbitration cycle are to be processed relative to the commands associated with the queued agent identifiers; and overriding the predetermined bus arbitration cycle and processing the commands associated with the agent identifiers that have been queued according to the desired processing ratio indicated by the controllable configuration parameters. The cited teachings of Borland neither teach nor suggest these limitations.

The Office Action cites Borland's retry queue as corresponding to these limitations. However, not only is there no teaching of granting bus ownership, but there is no apparent overriding of a predetermined bus arbitration cycle according to the desired ratio. Borland teaches "a programmed delay between each retry attempt to prevent degradation of system performance" for transactions placed in the retry queue. Thus, there is no apparent relationship or relevance to the claim limitations, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 17-20 depend from claim 14, and claims 23-27, 33, and 36 include limitations similar to those described above for claims 1 and 14. Thus, claims 17-20, 23-27, 33, and 36 are not shown to be anticipated for at least the reasons set forth above.

The rejection of claims 1, 8-10, 14, 17-20, 23-27, 33 and 36 should be withdrawn because the limitations are not shown to be taught by Borland.

The Office Action does not establish that claims 1, 8-10, 14, 18, 19, 21-25, 27, 33 and 36 are anticipated by "Kavi" (Multithreaded Systems by Kavi et al.) under 35

USC §102(b). The rejection is respectfully traversed because the Office Action fails to show that all the limitations of the claims are taught by Kavi.

The cited teachings of Kavi contain no apparent reference to granting of bus ownership as set forth in the independent claims 1, 14, 23, 27, 33, and 36. Kavi's page 24 shows and describes 4096 switching nodes. Thus, there is no apparent bus for which ownership is to be granted. Furthermore, the cited teaching of Kavi does not suggest overriding the predetermined bus arbitration order as claimed. The cited portion of Kavi simply teaches placing failed memory accesses on a retry queue and retrying the operation several times before trapping the stream that issued the failed memory access. Thus, there is no apparent overriding of the predetermined bus arbitration order. Nor are there any apparent elements in Kavi that suggest the claimed configurable ratio of a number grants of ownership to the other agents seeking ownership of the bus and issuing commands not retried, to a number of grants of ownership to queued agents.

Since the cited portions of Kavi do not contain any elements that reasonably correspond to the claim limitations, further explanation is respectfully requested as to those elements of Kavi that are viewed as corresponding to the claim limitations. Otherwise, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 8-10, 18, 19, 21-22, and 24-25 are dependent claims and include further limitations that refine the limitations of the base claims. Thus, claims 8-10, 18, 19, 21-22, and 24-25 are also not shown to be anticipated by Kavi.

The rejection of claims 1, 8-10, 14, 18, 19, 21-25, 27, 33 and 36 as being anticipated by Kavi should be withdrawn because the Office Action fails to show that Kavi teaches all the limitations of these claims.

No extension of time is believed to be necessary for consideration of this response. However, if an extension of time is required, please consider this a petition for a sufficient number of months for consideration of this response. If there are any additional fees in connection with this response, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0996 (USYS.088PA).

Respectfully submitted,

CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC
1270 Northland Drive, Suite 390
Saint Paul, MN 55120
(651) 686-6633

By: 
Name: LeRoy D. Maunu
Reg. No.: 35,274